



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,344	12/12/2003	Robert Williamson	38898-0055	7457

7590 02/24/2005

Mr. William B. Vass
c/o Ridout & Maybee LLP
Suite 2400
One Queen Street East
Toronto, ON M5C 3B1
CANADA

EXAMINER

SINGH, RAMNANDAN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2644

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/733,344

Applicant(s)

WILLIAMSON, ROBERT

Examiner

Ramnandan Singh

Art Unit

2644

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Krauss et al [US 6,393,115 B1].

Regarding claim 1, Krauss et al teach an apparatus for dialing a number for a communication terminal shown in Figs. 1 and 2, the number being stored in a directory with a plurality of numbers, the communication terminal having a key pad for a user, the apparatus comprising:

an input for receiving digits entered by the user using the key pad (6);

a comparator for comparing (i.e. **matching**) the received digits to a plurality of directory entries stored in the directory server (5) [col. 8, lines 44-48];

a component (8) for retrieving directory entries matching the received digits;

a display (11) for displaying the retrieved directory entries [col. 8, lines 36-38];

a component (8) for prompting the user for an additional entry in response to more than one matched directory entry being displayed [Fig. 5e];

a component (**keyboard 6 or mouse 7**) for selecting one of the retrieved directory entries [col. 8, lines 38-42]; and

a component for dialing the number associated with the selected directory entry [Figs. 1-5; col. 2, line 36 to col. 4, line 35; col. 5, line 11 to col. 7, line 36; col. 8, line 24 to col. 9, line 12; claim 1-22].

Claims 10 and 17 are essentially similar to claim 1 are rejected for the reasons stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-7, 11-15, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krauss et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Flemming et al [US 4,009,347].

Regarding claim 2, although Krauss et al teach comparing a plurality of entries [Figs 3-5], they do not disclose expressly the details regarding the structure used for comparing the entries. So one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to seek any known structure suitable for comparing the entries such as a digital counter of Flemming et al.

Flemming et al teach a digit counter for counting dial digits shown in Fig. 18 [col. 23, line 40 to col. 25, line 7].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the digit counter of Flemming et al with Krauss et al in order to count the digits (i.e. an entry) received and apply the output of the counter to a comparator to determine matching directory entries.

Claims 11 and 18 are essentially similar to claim 2 and are rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding claim 3, Krauss et al further teach the apparatus , wherein the directory entries comprise a number and a name, and the name being mapped to digits on the key pad [col. 5, lines 25-29].

Claims 14 and 19 are essentially similar to claim 3 and are rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding claims 4, 15, 20, the limitations are shown above.

Regarding claim 5, Krauss et al further teach the apparatus, wherein the additional entry comprises digits entered by the user using the key pad (6) [Figs. 2, 3A].

Claim 13 is essentially similar to claim 5 and is rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding claims 6 and 7, Krauss et al further teach the apparatus, wherein the additional entry comprises a navigational key entry (i.e. using menu selection) [col. 7, lines 38-45; col. 8, lines 24-32].

Regarding claim 12, the limitation is shown above.

5. Claims 8, 9 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Krauss et al and Flemming et al as applied to claims 3 and 2 respectively above, and further in view of Carmon et al [US 4,607,144 A].

Regarding claims 8 and 9, the combination of Krauss et al and Flemming et al does not teach expressly the communication terminal including a handset and line selection keys. However, the use of a handset in a communication terminal is well-known in the art.

Carmon et al teach a communication terminal that includes a handset and a line selection key, and the component of dialing in response to the handset being lifted by

the user and to one of the line selection keys [col. 10, lines 16-26; col. 10, line 59 to col. 11, line 3; col. 12, lines 8-12].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the handset and the line selection key of Carmon et al with Krauss et al and Flemming et al in order to enhance the use of electromechanical key telephone systems for full duplex communication [Carmon et al; col. 1, lines 8-9; col. 10, lines 16-18].

Claim 16 is essentially similar to claim 9 and is rejected for the reasons stated above.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.



Bourg et al [US 4,734,931] teach an integrated calling directory by matching entries [Fig. 12, col. 30, lines 17-41; col. 31, line 58 to col. 32, line 10] and using message counters (421 and 438) [Fig. 5; col. 8, lines 12-27; col. 9, lines 13-36].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramnandan Singh whose telephone number is (703)308-6270. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tran Sinh can be reached on (703)-305-4040. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ramnandan Singh
Examiner
Art Unit 2644

SINH TRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER